

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 2, 2013

Applicant	County of Ventura Watershed Protection District	Amount Requested	\$4,000,000
Proposal Title	South Oxnard Stormwater Flood Management Project	Total Proposal Cost	\$9,527,069

PROJECT SUMMARY

The project implements Phase 1 and 2a of a 4 Phase flood project. The project will replace a 5,400-foot portion of the 2.2-mile long existing trapezoidal storm drain with a larger capacity concrete drain to increase the current 10-year flood protection to 100-year protection. The project will also reduce trash inputs to the Ormond Lagoon, a sensitive natural area by installing a trash removal boom in the upstream portion of the channel.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	9/15	Technical Justification	4/10
Budget	2/5		
Schedule	4/5	Benefits and Cost Analysis	12/30
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	1/5	Program Preferences	3/10
Total Score (max. possible = 80)			35

EVALUATION SUMMARY

WORK PLAN

The criterion for the work plan is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The relationship between the primary goals and objectives of the project are stated on pg. 2, consistent with the adopted IRWM Plan objective of protecting people, property, and the environment from adverse flooding. However, the secondary goals of the project—protecting water quality and sustaining ecosystems—toward furthering IRWMP objectives is not clear. The design and construction tasks are very preliminary and not of sufficient detail to determine if the project is ready to implement. Work proposed to be paid under “another state grant is not detailed,” nor is any indication given of whether these funds are certain. From the work plan it is not clear if the project consists of Phases 1 and 2a (top of pg. 2, or only phase 2a (bottom on pg. 2). The funding of all additional phases seems to be uncertain and the applicant states full project benefits necessitates that all four phases be completed (pg. 4). The

applicant does not make clear whether the completion of the proposed project can be operational as a standalone project without phases 3 and 4.

BUDGET

The budget does not contain detailed cost information, many of the cost cannot be verified as reasonable, and supporting documentation is lacking for all of the budget categories. The applicant has not accurately reflected the total project costs for certain budget categories/tasks. For instance, for budget categories (c) and (e), no costs are indicated on the basis that the cost will be borne by “another grant.” These costs, together with the funding source and status of that funding must be included because they are necessary to complete the project. Many of the construction tasks are given as lump sums without any supporting information as back-up to justify that lump sum estimates are a reasonable alternative to time and materials, so the reviewers cannot judge them as reasonable. The railroad restoration subtask is not included in the work plan scope. The applicant states that the total construction cost is \$8 Million, although the total of the budgeted costs for Phase 1 and Phase 2 totals over \$24 Million. There is no basis of estimate, except for project administration hourly rates, that adequately describes how the budget was derived and any cost assumptions.

SCHEDULE

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The tasks in the schedule are not consistent with the work plan. For example, the schedule lists task by project phase and task numbers, but the work plan lists tasks by category (e.g. administration, construction) and by different task numbers. The schedule includes a task (Railroad Restoration) that is not present in the work plan. Even though these task numbers do not match, the task descriptions in the work plan do make the schedule reasonable. The work plan states that the covering of phase 2B (covering the open channel) will require additional CEQA review which will commence upon grant funding award. The schedule shows CEQA complete by April 2013, which is clearly not reasonable. However, the construction on Phase 1 (not requiring added CEQA) does seem reasonable to begin no later than October 2014. No narrative is provided to explain the schedule, for instance, to explain any assumptions involving wet weather delays in construction, since the schedule shows construction will proceed during the fall and winter months.

MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The criterion is minimally addressed and not documented. The applicant presents monitoring criteria for the goal of trash reduction in the waterway, but presents no target for assessing reduced flood damage, or for any of the other project benefits claimed. The proposal defers detailed description of monitoring, assessment, and performance measures as a future work plan deliverable Task 5. However, Task 5 encompasses planning/design/engineering/environmental documentation, not monitoring targets for the benefits that the applicant states the proposed project will deliver.

TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION

The technical justification for the project cannot be determined due to the lack of documentation that demonstrates the technical adequacy, and physical benefits are not described well. It is unclear what areas will flood in a storm event and how the flood damages are calculated. The benefits appear to pertain to the entire 4-phase project, and it is uncertain when and whether the remaining phases will be completed to provide the identified benefits. For example, the water quality and recreational benefits depend on the construction of a cover on the open channel to create a linear park, but construction of the cover is not part of the work plan. Although a target for trash removal from the waterway is given,

there is no supporting information to justify how the removal of nine tons a year of trash per year is determined. In the absence of baseline information of how much trash is currently discharged through the channel, there is no way to evaluate whether nine tons of trash is an appropriate target. The applicant claims that the project will enhance ecosystem restoration, but provides no information in support of this claim. In fact, covering of the channel may actually interfere with future efforts to restore the ecosystem benefits of the channel.

BENEFITS AND COSTS EVALUATION

Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a medium level of benefits in relationship to cost, but the quality of the analysis or clear and complete documentation is lacking.

The net present value (NPV) costs are unknown. No Table 16 is provided, so the timing of costs, discounting, and subsequent comparison with benefits are not provided. Total project cost is \$9.53 million, but the cost in the economic analysis is based on the cost of Phase 1 and 2 combined (\$26.5 million) minus “current replacement costs” (\$7.5 million), or \$19 million.

The attachment 7 technical justification and attachment 8 are more or less combined. On page 6 of Attachment 7, Phase 1 and 2 flood damage estimates are presented for the 1 in 100 year event. These estimates (\$30,945,514) are carried into Page 1 Attachment 8, where additional benefits are added to obtain an event damage of \$31,295,106 (Page 2 Attachment 8). EAD calculations using this event damage are shown in Page 2 Attachment 7. Event damages for the 50-year and 25-year event are also used, but they are not documented. “The 10-year, 25-year and 50-year damages are projections based on the calculated 100-year event.” No information regarding this critical step is provided.

The EAD is calculated to be \$1,708,794 and this is worth \$21.143 million in NPV terms. However, Table 7-1 shows the wrong event probability (EP) associated with most of the “Hydraulic Events.” The corrected EAD is \$1,395,843, not the \$1,708,794 claimed, and the corrected NPV is \$17,271,231.

The proposal requests funding for Phase 1 and 2a but not phase 2b. The requested funds are expected to provide the flood damage reduction displayed in Attachments 7 and 8. However, the project would be incomplete. It is not clear if, how or when Phase 2b might be funded, or if the open channel from Hueneme Road to Pleasant Valley would be a safety hazard. Phase 1 and 2a of the project might provide trash reduction benefits as claimed. However, some other benefits discussed, including some water quality and recreation benefits, would not be provided until Phase 2b is funded. Table 13, the non-monetized benefits checklist, is not provided.

PROGRAM PREFERENCES

The following Statewide Preferences were adequately demonstrated with a high degree of certainty to be met by the proposed project: Practice Integrated Flood Management, Protect Surface Water and Groundwater Quality, and, Ensure Equitable Distribution of Benefits.